

REMARKS

Claims 29-36 and 40 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-13, 16-24, 27, 28 and 37-39 have been cancelled. Claim 40 is new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

PRIORITY DOCUMENTS

The Examiner noted on Form PTOL-326 that none of the priority documents had been received in this application. This application is a divisional of Serial No. 09/526,971 now Patent No. 6,614,633. In Paper No. 17 of Serial No. 09/526,971 acknowledgement that all certified copies of the priority documents were received was indicated. Applicant requests the Examiner to acknowledge receipt of these documents in the parent application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 29, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,356) in view of Rogers (U.S. Pat. No. 5,049,763). Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez, et al. in view of Rogers and Chrysostomides, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,646,434). Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez, et al. in view of Rogers, Mekdhanasarn, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,796,570) and Lin, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,818,086). Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez, et al. in view of Rogers and

Costa, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,578,860). Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez, et al. in view of Rogers and Williams (U.S. Pat. No. 5,517,379). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant believes the wiring member of Rogers serving as a parasitic inductance is connected in series to the output stage including transistors Q₁ to Q₅ as is apparent from Figure 1 and Figure 3 and not in parallel as stated by the Examiner.

Neither Rodriguez, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,356) nor Rogers (U.S. Pat. No. 5,049,763) disclose, teach or suggest utilizing the back electromotive force, which the wiring member serving as a parasitic inductance generates when a surge current flows through the wiring member, for increasing the voltage applied to the gate electrode of the insulated gate electrode. Utilizing the back electromotive force for increasing the voltage applied to the gate electrode of the insulated gate electrode is possible when the wiring member is connected in parallel with the gate voltage-boosting element as defined in Claim 29 and it is not possible when the wiring member is connected in series to the gate voltage-boosting element as is the case when Rogers is combined with Rodriguez, et al.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 29 patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 30-35, which ultimately depend from Claim 29, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJOINDER

Applicant respectfully requests the rejoinder of Claim 36.

NEW CLAIM

New Claim 40 is a dependent claim depending from Claim 29 and it further defines the gate voltage boosting element. Applicant believes Claim 40 reads on the elected species.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 11, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg